



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/801,464	02/18/1997	AKIRA FUNAKOSHI	CFO-11946-US	6299

S514 7590 02/26/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/801,464

Applicant(s)

Funakoshi et al.

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 22, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendments filed July 23, 2002 and November 22, 2002 have been entered. It is noted that in view of the new amendment practice under 37 CFR 1.121 which became mandatory for all amendments on March 1, 2001, and due to the limited amount of examining time per application, if the amendment contains changes to existing language that requires a marked-up version showing those changes, the Examiner is relying upon the marked-up version(s) for examination of the application. It is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the clean version(s) is (are) the same as the marked-up version(s). It is further noted that the clean version(s) is (are) considered to be the Official version(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are replete with vague and indefinite language and should be carefully reviewed. The following are examples of many of the occurrences of such language.

In claim 35, lines 4-5, the recitation “and on a side facing another substrate” is vague and indefinite as to what it refers (e.g., to the cutting step or to how the slice line is provided); in lines 5-6, the recitation “which is one of the substrates when the plurality of substrates are arranged” is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth; in lines 6-7, “a cutting position” is

Art Unit: 3724

vague as to whether it refers to that previously recited in line 6 or to another such cutting position; in line 8, the recitation "cutting the substrate of a side" is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth; in line 10, the recitation "adjacently arranging the plurality of substrates" renders the claims vague and indefinite and appears to lack antecedent basis with respect to the cutting of a substrate since "a plurality of substrates" has not been positively set forth as part of the claimed method (i.e., the claim is directed to "a method of cutting a substrate" which is used in a semiconductor device, wherein the semiconductor device is constructed by arranging a plurality of substrates - however, the plurality of substrates are not recited as being part of the claimed invention, only as part of an intended use of the substrate); in lines 11-12, the recitation "while correcting the cutting position of the substrates" is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth.

In claim 40, line 5-6, the recitation "and on a side opposing another substrate" is vague and indefinite as to what it refers (e.g., to the cutting step or to how the slice line is provided); in line 6, the recitation "which is one of the substrates when the plurality of substrates are arranged" is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth; in lines 7-8, "a cutting position" is vague as to whether it refers to that previously recited in line 6 or to another such cutting position.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 35-43, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gautron, pn 3,398,620.

Gautron discloses a cutting method with almost every active step of the claimed process as best understood from the claims including cutting a substrate (e.g., T) having a slice line (e.g., D) and a guide line which is an electrode line/layer (e.g., 13), and detecting a position of the guide line (e.g., with 15, 16) and correcting the cutting position using the guide line. It is noted that all four sides of the work piece of Gautron have been previously cut without correction to form the raw material sheet. Gautron only lacks the specific work piece on which the method is performed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to adapt the method of Gautron to gain the benefits taught thereby including a process for accurately

Art Unit: 3724

cutting along a line in a sheet or otherwise flat piece of material, particularly on a substrate of a thin film semi-conductor device to gain the advantages taught by Gautron.

In the alternative, it is argued that Gautron is silent as to how the raw material sheet is formed, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide raw material that has been cut out without using a cutter position correcting step for various known benefits including facilitating faster and more efficient work piece processing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to forming the work piece of Gautron without using a cutter position correcting step for the well known benefits including that described above.

It is noted that the “adjacently arranging” step of claim 35 has not been significant patentable weight since it is not directed to the claimed invention (i.e., cutting a substrate) but rather is directed to the semiconductor device which is described as an intended use for the cut substrate.

Regarding claims 36 and 41, these claims have not been given significant patentable weight since it is not clear how the limitations therein further define any of the active method steps, and thus these limitations do not affect the claimed method in a manipulative sense.

Art Unit: 3724

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed July 23, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404. The examiner's typical work schedule is Tuesday through Friday, and he can be reached during normal business hours on these days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Allan Shoap, can be reached at (703)308-1082.

Application/Control Number: 08/801,464

Page 7

Art Unit: 3724

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3590; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.



Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cfd
February 24, 2003